REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 23, 2009, the Examiner stated that the replacement drawings that were received on March 24, 2009 were not acceptable, because they do not sufficiently describe the claimed invention. The Examiner stated the amended version of Figure 1 submitted on March 24, 2009 shows the newly added gradient coil and RF coil, but the Examiner stated the drawings do not sufficiently show coils "carried by" the compound as claimed. The Examiner stated the amended version of Figure 1 appears to show the coils in the compound, rather than "carried by" the compound.

This rejection is respectfully traversed, for numerous reasons.

First and foremost, there is nothing inconsistent with the ordinary dictionary definition of "carried" as encompassing a structure or component that "carries" an item by virtue of the carried item being received in or contained in the structure or component. For example, it is common to refer to papers as being carried *in* a briefcase, particles or other items being carried *in* a flow of water or air, oxygen being carried *in* blood, etc. For each of those phrases, if the word "in" were replaced by the word "by" the commonly understood meaning of the phrase would not be altered in any manner. Therefore, Applicants submit that the showing of the RF coil and the gradient coil in amended Figure 1 as being embedded in the sealing compound is completely consistent with the claim language stating that those items are "carried by" the sealing compound. There is nothing in the ordinary dictionary definition of the phrase "carried by" that means the RF coil and the gradient coil must be, for example, attached to the compound in some manner, or located on a surface of the compound in some manner.

Moreover, the amended version of Figure 1 was intentionally drafted in a manner that is as schematic and general as possible, in view of the (admittedly) very general term "carried by" in claim 1, and in view of the fact that the manner by which the compound carries the RF coil and the gradient coil does not form any part of the invention. The amended version of Figure 1 clearly shows the RF coil and the gradient coil as being "carried by" the sealing compound 3, and nothing more detailed is being claimed. Therefore, Figure 1 as amended in Applicants' previous response is entirely consistent with the claimed subject matter.

A further factor that must be taken into account is that the manner by which RF coils and gradient coils can be carried by a sealing compound in a magnetic resonance scanner is well known to those of ordinary skili in the field of designing magnetic resonance systems. Details of how an RF coil and gradient coil and gradient coils can be combined with the sealing compound or prodding resin that is conventionally used to form the tube or patient tunnel of a magnetic resonance scanner are well known, and many different ways that such mounting can occur are available. For example, the Pla et al. reference relied upon by the Examiner as prior art against the subject matter of the present application assumes that such mounting is so well known that it need not even be shown in the drawings. Nevertheless, other examples of such mounting are widely available in the prior art of record, such as Figures 27 and 28 of the Takamori et al. reference, Figures 12 and 15 of published PCT application WO 98/13821, submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 19, 2004,. Figures 4 and 7 of Yoshino et al., and all of the figures of DE 197 22 211 A1, both of the latter references being submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed April 19, 2004.

Not only do all of these references provide ample evidence that the manner of combining RF coils and/or gradient coils with a sealing compound or resin that forms the patient tunnel of a magnetic resonance apparatus is well known, in many versions, to those of ordinary skill in the art, but also those references provide numerous examples of RF coils and gradient coils that are "carried by" the sealing compound. A person of ordinary skill in the field of designing magnetic resonance systems, upon viewing any of these references, would have no difficulty in describing the RF coils and/or the gradient coils as being "carried by" the sealing compound disclosed in those references.

Additionally, claims 1-3 were rejected under §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, for the same reasons noted above with regard to the drawing objection. The Examiner stated the specification does not provide sufficient enablement as to the way by which the coils are "carried by" the compound as claimed.

As noted above, the claims do *not* claim the "way" that the coils are "carried by" the compound, but merely state, as was intentional, in very general terms that the coils are "carried by" the compound. Since no details are claimed as to the "way" by which the coils are "carried by" the compound, no further details need be provided in the specification (nor in the drawings).

Despite Applicants' belief that both the drawing objection and the rejection under §112, first paragraph are incorrect, independent claim 1 has been editorially amended to avoid the use of the term "carried by" and has been revised to even more generally claim "cured sealing compound comprising at least one RF coil therein and at least one gradient coil therein for magnetic resonance imaging...".

This is clearly commensurate with the amended version of claim 1 that was previously submitted, and is fully supported not only in the specification as originally filed, but also by the aforementioned examples of the extensive knowledge possessed on this point by those of ordinary skill in the field of magnetic resonance imaging.

The drawings are therefore submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of 35 U.S.C. §1.83 and §1.84, and the claims are submitted to be in full compliance with all provisions of §112, first paragraph. Early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by,

/STEVEN H. NOLL/ (Reg. 28,982)
SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
233 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 6600
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants

CH2\7916363.1